Remarks/Arguments

At present claims 1, 13, 25 and 37 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the patent to Huff et al. (US Patent Number 6,457,064 issued September 24, 2002 based upon an application that was filed on April 27, 1998) in view of the document titled "UNIX Internals." In light of the amendments made herein and the comments presented below both of these rejections are respectfully traversed. Accordingly, claims 1-48 remain pending in the present application.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 it is noted that applicants herein have added the single word "other" in response to the concerns that the Examiner has raised. It is noted that precisely for the reasons that the Examiner indicates it was and is applicants' attorney's position that the word "other" is merely clarifying and in no way limiting. In particular, the Examiner indicates that the recited step is vague because it is unclear "why when the threads which are awakened and are executing, they are being tested to see whether they are ready to run." Clearly a thread that is awakened does not need to test itself to see if it is ready to run. The testing is done for other threads that may be in a ready state. This modification to applicants' claims does not in any way add new matter to applicants' claims or specification. In particular, support for this modification is found in applicants' specification on page 11, line 24 through page 12, line 14. It is noted that this minor amendment to applicants' independent claims is for purposes of clarification and does not in any way change the scope or nature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is now respectfully requested that the rejection of applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Attention is next directed to the art based rejection of applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In this regard, it is noted that the patent to Huff et al. teaches a process which is

specifically taught against in applicants' specification. In particular, the patent to Huff et al. requires the starting of a brand new thread. In particular, in Huff et al. this new thread is called a polling thread. In particular, the Examiner's attention is directed to the abstract in Huff et al. which recites as follows:

> "A process is alerted that an input event effecting one of its active connection threads has been received. An input polling thread in the process is enabled and is used, in conjunction with other thread-specific data, to determine which of the threads in the process has an event directed to it...The input polling thread for process detects input events for its process and causes the appropriate connection thread in the process to be assigned a light-weight process when the connection thread needs it to execute." [Emphasis added herein.]

Again, the Examiner's attention is directed to yet another portion of the patent to Huff et al., namely column 3, lines 10-13 wherein the following recitation is found:

> "An input event directed at an active connection thread is received and a polling thread is used to determine which active connection thread the input event is directed to."

Yet again in column 6, lines 30-34, the following recitation is found:

> "The thread associated with the input weight table invokes a special thread referred to as a polling thread when an input event is received."

It is clear from the recitations found above in the patent to Huff et al. that they specifically teach the startup of another thread called of a polling thread. In stark contrast, in applicants' claimed invention, there is neither need nor use for the invocation of a polling thread. Instead, the polling function is carried out by the thread that is awakened. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to the language found in applicants' independent claim 1 which

recites: "executing said awakened thread which processes the received message <u>and tests to see if</u> <u>any other threads are ready to run.</u>" It is clear from this language that it is the awakened thread itself which tests to see if any other threads are ready to run. In other words it is the awakened thread itself that performs a "polling" operation. Clearly this is advantageous in that it avoids the initialization and starting of another thread. In this regard, it is pointed out that the starting of a new thread is an operation that consumes both time and resources. Accordingly, it is seen that the patent to Huff et al. specifically teaches away from this aspect of the claimed invention. The teachings from the "UNIX Internals" document that the Examiner proffers do not in any way correct this fundamental defect. Accordingly, it is seen that applicants' claimed invention would not in any way be obvious in view of the two cited documents. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of applicants' claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

It is noted that the present response does not require the payment of any additional fees. It is also noted that the present response is being submitted after the two month time period for which it is required that the Examiner provide an Advisory Action. It is also noted that the present response is also being submitted with a Notice of Appeal.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular cited document or combination of documents.

Accordingly, it is now seen that all of the applicants' claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, early notification of the allowability of applicants' claims is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if there are any matters which the Examiner feels could be expeditiously considered and which would forward the prosecution of the instant application, applicants' attorney wishes to indicate his willingness to engage in any telephonic communication in

furtherance of this objective. Accordingly, applicants' attorney may be reached for this purpose at the numbers provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jan. 26, 2005
_____
Date

Lawrence D. Cutter
_____
LAWRENCE D. CUTTER, Sr. Attorney
Reg. No. 28,501

IBM Corporation, IP Law Dept.
2455 South Rd., M/S P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Phone: (845) 433-1172
FAX: (845) 432-9786
EMAIL: cutter@us.ibm.com